Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

eserve
7281.9
V59

1953 ANNUAL

VERMONT PMA CONFERENCE REPORT

LIBRARY
RECEIVED
DEC 11 1953
U. S. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE

Burlington, Vermont

May 28 - 29, 1953

REPORT OF ANNUAL PMA CONFERENCE

Vermont State and County Committeemen, County Office Managers, County Agents, and Guests.

Held at Hotel Vermont, Burlington, Vermont, May 28 - 29, 1953

Foreword

This report presents the principal talks and committee reports of the 1953 Annual Vermont PMA Conference. The two-day conference brought together, through its three committees, the farmer thinking and recommendations which will form the groundwork for the months ahead in the Vermont Production and Marketing Administration's program of work.

The recommendations included in the report are as they were approved by the entire conference. They will be later reviewed and considered by the Vermont State PMA Committee.

This 1953 conference brought before us new challenges for greater cooperation of allied agencies and a renewed determination for greater achievement.

We were pleased and felt honored that Mr. Howard Gordon, Administrator of the Production and Marketing Administration, and Mr. E. M. Norton, Director of the Dairy Branch of PMA, came to our conference and brought to us their knowledge and understanding. We were pleased also to welcome guests from the neighboring States of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Connecticut.

We greatly appreciate the efforts and wholehearted cooperation of all who helped in any way in contributing to the success of our 1953 PMA Conference.

State Committee

Thomas F. Macauley, Chairman
L. Earl Wilson, Vice Chairman
Hugh E. Evans, Member
Edward K. Wright, Member
James W. Williams, Member

State Office

A. F. Heald, Executive Officer
E. N. Blondin, Fieldman
C. B. Doane, Fieldman

CONFERENCE THEME

Conserving While Producing

Vermont farmers are proud of their rugged individualism and their freedom. They have played a very great part in the making of the history of this country.

State, county and community PMA committeemen carry on this heritage in their every day work. It has shown up in the kind of a program that we have had in this State.

We should keep in mind throughout this conference how we can do a better job of "Conserving While Producing." We should say what we think and act accordingly. We should have our minds open to improvements in order to make progress. We should have the desire to do right and improve ourselves and our surroundings.

A G E N D A

Vermont State PMA Conference
May 28-29, 1953
Hotel Vermont, Burlington, Vermont

Program - May 28

9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.	Register, get name tags and banquet tickets at Conference Registration Desk in Lobby.	
	Conference Opened by L. Earl Wilson, Presiding	
10:00 a.m.	Conference Goals Introduction of Delegates and Guests	Thomas F. Macauley, Chairman, State PMA Committee
10:15 a.m.	The New PMA Set-up and Its Challenges	Howard Gordon Administrator, PMA
11:15 a.m.	A County Agent Looks at ACP	Ralph C. McWilliams Franklin County Agent
12:00	Lunch	
	Hugh E. Evans, Presiding	
1:00 p.m.	Outline Procedure for State Committee Nominations	L. Earl Wilson State PMA Committeeman
1:15 p.m.	Conference Committee Assignments	
	A. Program Planning Committee	
	B. Administrative Problems Committee	
	C. Public Relations Committee	
1:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.	Conference Committee Meetings	

Note: County office managers may sit in on the conference committee of their choice or may work with the State Office staff during Thursday afternoon's session.

CONFERENCE BANQUET

May 28, 1953

6:30 p.m. -- Main Dining Room

Toastmaster -- E. Frank Branon
State Committee Alumnus

PROGRAM

Music

"The Dairy Situation" — E. M. Norton, Director
Dairy Branch, PMA

Program - May 29

James W. Williams, Presiding

9:00 a.m.	Working Together to Accomplish Our Goals	
	Discussion led by	E. K. Wright State Committeeman
	Panel Members	A. R. Gray Area Conservationist, SCS
		A. W. Gottlieb Deputy State Forester
		R. P. Davison County Agent Leader
		Gerald Wheeler U. S. Forest Service
		Edson Gifford State SC Committee
10:00 a.m.	Some Vermont PMA Accomplishments and Challenges	A. F. Heald Executive Officer, State PMA
10:30 a.m.	Report of Committee on Program Planning	L. Earl Wilson State PMA Committeeman
	Discussion - Changes - Adoption	
12:00	Lunch	

E. K. Wright, Presiding

1:30 p.m.	Report of Committee on Public Relations	Hugh Evans State PMA Committeeman
	Discussion - Changes - Adoption	
2:00 p.m.	Report of Committee on Administrative Problems	E. K. Wright State PMA Committeeman
	Discussion - Changes - Adoption	
2:30 p.m.	Nominations for State Committee	L. Earl Wilson State PMA Committeeman
3:00 p.m.	Conference Summary	
3:30 p.m.	Adjourn	

OPENING REMARKS

By Thomas F. Macauley, Chairman, Vermont PMA State Committee, at the Annual Vermont PMA Conference, Hotel Vermont, Burlington, Vermont, May 28, 1953.

I would like at this time to have the county committeemen and alternate county committeemen stand and introduce themselves by counties, also have the county agents present introduce themselves, also delegates from other agricultural agencies present introduce themselves.

Ext. - R. P. Davison
S.C.S. - Al Gray
Forest Service - Gerald Wheeler and Al Gottlieb
F.H.A. - Cloyes T. Gleason
Vocational Education - Cola Watson
Assistant Director Selective Service - Major Ashton
Commissioner of Agriculture - Stanley Judd

I would now like to recognize the people from the Washington Office -- Howard Gordon, Administrator of PMA, and C. Ely Wickham, Area Director.

We have delegates and guests from other states that I would like to recognize: Harold Hardy, New Hampshire State Chairman, and Don Davis, Fieldman; Walter Clark, Executive Officer from Connecticut; and Harold Tompson, State Chairman, and Robert Bieber, Fieldman from Massachusetts.

I would like to make a few remarks in regard to the conference goals as I see them. This is the 18th year of a State Committee set-up in Vermont. Today and tomorrow we will be planning our 19th Agricultural Conservation Program. As I see our goals at this Annual Conference we should very carefully review the work given to us as PMA Committees. We should see what has been done and should endeavor to work out ways and means of doing them better in the future. I have been a farmer-committeeman working with this program for the past 18 years. I am proud of some of our accomplishments and I hope you are, but at this "working conference" let's dig into our problems and shoot for higher goals. I believe that the farmer-committeeman system is sound and has proven that the program is being operated efficiently.

Now I would like to make a few remarks in regard to the working committees and I will have to make them brief as my time is limited. We have three working committees at this conference. They are: Program Planning Committee, Administrative Problems Committee, and Public Relations Committee.

For you who are serving on the Program Planning Committee, I hope you will resolve to give every consideration to the recommendations from back home. I have reviewed the summary of recommendations from the 14 counties as they will be presented to you for your consideration. You should remember you are the elected committeemen representing the farmers of your area. You have a great responsibility and a duty to perform in carrying out their wishes. I also hope that you will give full consideration to the Department's recommendations on ACP, but out of it all, come up with a program which you think is sound and will work in

Vermont. I wish to bring to your attention that the Secretary and his assistants are definitely on record before the House of Representatives Subcommittee to the effect that ACP Memo 5 is just a guide in planning the programs. They have also testified that they want and will consider all recommendations. We also know at this time that the House of Representatives has passed a bill authorizing 195 million dollars for the 1954 Program.

Now a few words to the Administrative Problems Committee. I hope you will analyze carefully our State, county and community committee system and our State and county office operations. I feel sure that with careful analysis you can come up with some recommendations which will help us to do a better job. I urge you particularly to make suggestions of ways and means of making our committee system more effective.

Now a word to the Public Relations Committee. In these times of debate and discussion about our program, I feel that it's even more important that we have a sound day-to-day program of Public Relations. I have seen much accomplished in the past four years in this field under the leadership of our Executive Officer, Mr. A. F. Heald. Some good work has been accomplished in many of the counties and there is yet much more to do, especially with farmer-producer organizations. I hope you will bring in some thought-provoking suggestions, also that you will keep your recommendations short and to the point and give us some specific jobs that we can do.

Now in conclusion, as we continue on through these two days of conference, let us have no fears about the future. I have great faith in this ACP program and with your help we can and will have strong farm programs. I wish you Godspeed and I thank you.

THE NEW PMA SET-UP AND ITS CHALLENGES

Address by Howard Gordon, Administrator, PMA,
at the Vermont State PMA Conference,
Burlington, Vermont, May 28, 1953

I am glad of this opportunity to visit with the folks who are getting out the program in the States. It is also a pleasure to get back to New England. My family and I have had two most pleasant visits in New England in past years; in fact, just last summer we came across the lake and headed down into New Hampshire on one of the most beautiful days you ever saw in late August. So, it's also nice to be back up here and see things looking so good and your prospect for crops so promising. It is also good to be in Senator Aiken's home State. Senator Aiken, I think, is one of the real Statesmen that we have in America today. Certainly he is a great agricultural statesman and we in the Department get the greatest satisfaction and pleasure out of working with him in the interest of agriculture throughout the United States. I feel sure your other representatives in Congress, your other Senator and your Congressman, are equally interested in agriculture and work very closely with Senator Aiken in helping solve your problems, so you are very fortunate indeed in having such fine leadership.

I think you are fortunate, also, in your State Executive Officer here. You know he got recognition here a few months ago for work far beyond the call of duty and work which resulted in a one-grade increase in his classification and that's what really counts, isn't it? I know from listening to you folks here this morning that you have real leadership here in the State of Vermont and it's a pleasure to be here with you, and it's also a very great pleasure to meet with you folks from the other New England States. I certainly appreciate very much your coming over to join with your Vermont neighbors here in this meeting as it gives me an opportunity to meet you and visit with you some.

I have some notes which I will follow in a moment. Ely Wickham got hold of me and looked up on my blind side and asked me to make a speech. I am not a speech-maker and he had me because almost as soon as I got to Washington I had to ask him to take an assignment of mine. He did do that and did a grand job so I couldn't refuse him this time.

I said it was a real pleasure to be up here and it is but not in the role of speech-maker. So I think the best thing to do is to just talk to you rather informally for a little while and then if there is some time let's take it up in discussion of some of the things that interest you.

I think it would be rather foolish for me to go into the various functions and responsibilities which we have in PMA. You folks are even more familiar with them than I. Your chairman just gave you something of my background and you will notice it did not include PMA experience up until January 20. I had a very difficult time getting familiar with the PMA set-up. I don't know whether you folks realize it or not but it is the biggest, the most sprawling, the most complex and most comprehensive program that I have ever seen or heard of in all my life. I was in the Secretary's staff

meeting one day in the early days and he said, "Where is such and such a thing?" I said, "I don't know, Mr. Secretary, but if you can't find it I'll guarantee it's in PMA." That's what PMA is, a Department of Agriculture in itself, and not a small Department either. We have in PMA, as you know, the administration of everything from the School Lunch Program to the International Wheat Agreement and about 10,000 things in between, part of which I have become acquainted with and many of which I have no hope to become acquainted with for a long time yet. Some of the folks say, "Well, in about two years you'll begin to find out what it's all about." I don't know whether I'll last two years or not. Some of them are good enough to say the first hundred years are the worst and I think that's probably fairly accurate.

But you folks do have here in your State program and your county program, a responsible job and a very comprehensive job when it comes to the administration of your program. You know PMA has always been considered a big farm-managed program and if you stop and analyze it, it probably is just about that.

Now the Secretary has done some regrouping. Some of you may have seen the headlines in the paper this morning about how he is going to tear the Department of Agriculture all to pieces. Well, that's just one of those newspaper headlines that catch folks' attention and it doesn't mean a thing in the world after you start reading. When he first took office he did set up the Department in about four or five functional groups, realizing that he could not possibly find the time to be with some twenty-odd different agencies. So he grouped those agencies into four or five groups in order that his time might be conserved and in order that the work of the various agencies could be better coordinated. The first group that he set up was the Commodity Marketing and Adjustment under John H. Davis; that included PMA, Commodity Credit Corporation, the Crop Insurance Program and the Commodity Exchange Authority. John Davis, as most of you probably know, was, at the time he came to Washington, Manager of the National Wool Marketing Cooperative in Boston. Prior to that for a number of years he had been Executive Secretary of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives and had served on many very important committees in the Government and has made a number of trips as official representative of the United States abroad. So he is an unusually well qualified person, a good thinker and I think perhaps of all the folks in the Department best known among the folks on the Hill, and highly respected by them.

Another group was the credit group made up of the Farm Credit Administration, the Farmers Home Administration and the REA, and that is now headed by Bob Farrington who had been the Commissioner for the Central Bank for Cooperatives. Bob Farrington has had years and years of experience in the Department and has done an awfully good job in the field of cooperative credit.

Then as Assistant Secretary heading up the Research, Extension and Land Use, we have Earl Coke who came to Washington from the post as Director of Extension in California. He had also been a Vice President of one of

the large sugar companies prior to that. He too is an extremely able man and he is the one who now sets your policies with respect to ACP and that change came about as a result of the desire of the Secretary to get in a single coordinated group everything which has to do with Land Use, conservation and that type of thing.

Then the Secretary has also set up very recently a Foreign Agricultural Service headed by Romeo Short who was formerly Vice President of the American Farm Bureau Federation. We have had, of course, an Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations but that hadn't functioned very satisfactorily and the Secretary felt that it was extremely important, in order to meet the problems which we face today to have a stronger Foreign Agricultural Service and one which could do some real work for us with respect to export and export markets.

And then there is another purely service group made up of the Hearing Examiners, the Library, the Office of Budget and Finance, Information, Personnel and Planning Operations, and those are headed up by one of your own men, Dick Aplin, a native of this State and who was administering the Boston Milk Order at the time he was called to Washington. I have seen him many and many a day when he wished that he were right back up here too. I'll tell you that. But, like some of the rest of us, he is getting his second wind now and doing a grand job and I am sure he will be a real credit to you.

Now, what all of that means insofar as PMA is concerned, boils down to just one thing. Of course, the newspapers ever since the first announcement, have talked about how PMA was being torn limb from limb and scattered over the face of the earth and nothing was left. Well, if that happened, the Lord only knows what it was before. That's all I've got to say. Actually, the only thing that happened was this. The responsibility for policy-making with respect to ACP was transferred, as I said, to Assistant Secretary Coke and he put at the head of the ACP Program, Mr. Don Williams who had been the Deputy Administrator for the Soil Conservation Service, and that's where it stopped. He relieved me of policy-making but he didn't give you folks any relief and I'm sure you found it out because you still have to administer the programs, you still have to make the recommendations, you still have to do all the things you have ever done with respect to the ACP, and of course we in Washington in PMA are charged with the usual administration of programs of that kind.

Now, with respect to the Commodity Credit Corporation, the papers made a big play on that saying it was being separated from PMA but that is not true. It is true that John Davis was given the title "President of Commodity Credit," whereas in prior years the Administrator had been President as well as Administrator of PMA. But there were reasons for that and at the same time the Administrator was made Executive Vice President of the Commodity Credit which means that, as usual, the Executive Vice Presidents do the work and the administration of Commodity Credit Corporation continues right where it's been before in PMA. So PMA has not been substantially changed with respect to its functions and still has as large a program as before to administer.

Mr. Heald wrote me a little note and suggested some of the things that you might want to know about and I will be glad to try and answer some of the questions he raised. These are the 4 questions he asked me to give particular attention to: (1) The future of the PMA set-up. (2) Will it be possible to maintain a 5-man State Committee? (3) Significance of organizational changes in Washington. (4) How would the work of the branches be carried out?

To answer the third question first, I would say the only way in which these organizational changes within the Department will affect PMA will be to secure a more effective, a more efficient and a better grouped operating organization, a little more direct line of authority and responsibilities than have prevailed before. In the newspaper this morning you will notice that the opponents of the reorganization plan said that the plan will give the Secretary of Agriculture a blank check and that he wouldn't tell anybody what he was going to do and that he could do just about anything he pleased. Well, perhaps he can but if you know the Secretary you will know that he will not do anything that will hurt the Department of Agriculture. As a matter of fact there was a large number of agencies within the Department of Agriculture over which he had no real authority. That may be surprising to you as it was to me, but there were a good many agencies in the Department over which he had no legal authority and those will be under the reorganization plan made directly responsible administratively to the Secretary so that he can develop a sound and well-coordinated program.

Of course, exempted from the reorganization plan will be the Federal Corporations like the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, the Farm Credit Administration and groups of that kind which have their own corporation charter.

Now, what's the future of the PMA set-up? Well, I don't see anything in the picture that will materially change it. Certainly, in the changes which we worked out with respect to the State and county committee set-up we did no violence to the system which you have here in Vermont and which actually supplied a model on which to develop a program. You folks here decided quite a little while ago that you didn't want your State Committeemen to have to leave their farms to do administrative work. You felt that you could get men, the very best qualified men in agriculture, best qualified for farm people, who were willing to devote part of their time to this very important program but it would be impossible for them to leave their farms and devote full time, and that's true throughout the country. So the change in the State Committee set-up is simply in that direction, that we will not be asking the State Committeemen to devote full time to administrative duties but to employ a good Executive or Administrative Officer and to make the policies and to see that those policies are carried out. And we think it's sound, we know it's sound, in fact, and I don't know of any program which has been more universally approved by the general farm organizations and by the agricultural leaders in Congress than that has. Now it's true

that that plan has been pretty much recognized in about half of the States. There are only about 13 States in which the State Committeemen are being used full time. But to show you how ridiculous this can be, in the State of Kentucky we had 5 State Committeemen working full time and we had an Administrative Officer working full time. Now does that make sense? Does that appeal to your good New England sense of thrift? Well, I'm no New Englander but I sure do hate to waste money and that certainly was a tremendous waste of money. In your county set-up you have a similar thing. You have the need for a good county office manager to carry out the day-to-day responsibilities under the direction of the leadership which you yourselves elect to develop the policy and see that the program is properly administered.

Now, I don't see any likelihood of change in that system -- it's a sound system. With respect to size of the State Committees, yes. There has been a great variation in the size of State Committees all over the country. They have varied in size from 3 to 5 as was provided in the law. We feel that 3 in most States is adequate. Of course, we want a State Committee which will recognize geographically and commodity-wise the problems which we find in any given State. And perhaps in a State like Texas, perhaps in a State like California, we may need 5 State Committeemen to get the commodity representation which is necessary on the State Committee. But certainly in the other States, including the New England States, it seems to us that a State Committee made up of 3 men is adequate and I suspect that that will be the policy come July 1. So I might as well be perfectly frank with you here and now and I first made sure from the approach you had to this committee problem that you will follow that. Now when I said a 5-man committee, of course, you realize that I'm talking about the appointed committeemen. I am not talking about your ex-officio member of the committee which will be in addition to the other committeemen.

I want to compliment you folks, too, on your system of selecting your State Committeemen. Goodness knows, if we had that system in effect all over this country Ely's and my lives would be a whole lot more comfortable and pleasant. We are in the midst now of trying to set up State Committees in those States where they are needed and we have approached it in just that way. Where we have State Committees that are utterly out of sympathy with the Secretary and his program and where they are actively beating the bushes to try to defeat his program, we have found it necessary to move in and to change the committees. Fortunately, that hasn't been necessary on a large scale but it has been necessary in some instances. And Lord what hot water you can get into. I'll tell you the honest truth. I just believe from what folks tell me that most folks would rather be a State PMA Committeeman than to be President of the United States. Certainly the Republican State Committeemen would have you believe this. One of the Congressmen called me the other day and he said, "By the way, where are you from," and I said I was from Virginia. He said, "How in the world did you get up here?" I said, "Well, I was drafted." And that's the truth because I sure wouldn't be here if I wasn't. He said, "What are your politics?" and I said I didn't have any. He said, "There ain't any use wasting

time with you," and hung up. That's just about the attitude they have toward us down there. Some of them don't hesitate to tell us that we don't know our politics and I frankly admit it and we go along and do the best we can. Certainly we are not going to make straight political appointments. I am sure there are plenty of good Republicans who will make good State Committeemen and where we find them they are going to be appointed. But where the choice lies between a good Democrat and a sorry Republican there ain't but one answer as far as I'm concerned. Now that isn't conducive to a long administration for the PMA Administrator, to be perfectly frank with you.

Here in New England I wouldn't think you would have any problems. In some of the Southern States there are some big problems. We have made a wonderful record-- in 4 months we have been able to change 4 State Committees and that means that at that rate at the end of 4 years we will have succeeded in setting up the 48 State Committees and 2 territorial committees or insular committees that are necessary. Well, that's the unpleasant side of the program. Believe me, it takes a wonderful sense of humor, an awful big sense of humor, to live with that kind of thing.

Now with respect to procedure for working with the various branches in Washington, I see no occasion to make any particular changes in that. I think that that procedure will continue as it has been in the past. The commodity branches are to continue as technical units, each branch concerned with its programs and with its problems of particular crops. The flow from Washington to the States and from the States to Washington will follow essentially the same channels as they have in the past through the Area Directors and the Administrator for Production. There, of course, have been changes in your Area Commodity Offices. The New York Office has been abolished for economy reasons and that work has been shifted back to the Chicago Office. You know that once the New York Office was set up to handle a specific problem - that was the export of grain at a time when there was a very heavy export movement on the East Coast. Now the work in that office has dropped down to the point where it represented only about 2% of the total volume of work throughout the United States and you can't justify an expensive Area Commodity Office for that volume of work. So it was necessary to break that up and throw it back to Chicago from whence it had come with the exception of the wool operation which went to Boston.

We are making some changes within the PMA itself -- some minor adjustments with the idea that we had the same problem that the Secretary had -- some 23 different branches reporting presumably direct to the Administrator. Well, sometimes I think about the only job I have is anything coming. Everybody who has ever had an idea in the last 20 years has been to Washington with it and he was turned down so he is back in Washington now presenting it again. Somebody has got to talk to them and the Secretary can't see them all and I get an awful lot of those. The Secretary called me one day and he says how was I getting along? And I told him, "Mr. Secretary, if I could just find time to do some work I'd feel like I was making a little progress." He laughed and said, "Well, I'll

tell you I'm glad somebody is in the same fix I am." I don't have enough time to work with our own folks, or haven't had up to the present time. We, of course, have had the budget and that has been most time-consuming. We have had a great deal of work, hearings before committees, etc., than you could count and we have had a good many of the commodity programs to develop. We have not completed them yet. So it has taken a tremendous amount of time which I would have been much happier to have spent with our own folks. So that means we do have to have some coordination and we are trying to get that through the three Assistant Administrators and the Deputy Administrator and more of that work is channeling through them. There will be perhaps two less branches there will be only three Assistant Administrators instead of the four I found when I came, but those are relatively minor changes and will not affect the program materially as you have experienced it in the past.

Now, I have tried to be as specific as possible in answering your questions. Anything but frank answers wouldn't mean anything to you and the only way I know how to talk to you is just put the cards out face up and that's what I've tried to do. I do want to say this to you. You may be disturbed about some of the policies you may read about. Now don't believe everything you read. As a matter of fact, I haven't found out what percentage of what you read you should believe, but it's an awful small percent. You do have in Washington as conscientious and able a group as has ever been assembled in the Department of Agriculture. Your Secretary of Agriculture is not only extremely able but he is just as conscientious as he knows how to be. Now he isn't going to scrap the programs which have been in effect over the years. Don't think that for one moment. In the first place, he knows that he was appointed to carry out the policies set by Congress and he is going to do it, not only in the letter of the law but in the full spirit of the law and then he hopes to begin there and build on it the kind of program which is needed under changing conditions. I'm sure you realize that conditions don't remain the same and programs can't remain static. Our support program hasn't had a real test yet. I think we are heading in for it. On at least two occasions it's been bailed out by wars. We were getting into real trouble at about the time of the Korean war. We are headed into worse trouble right now when it comes to the tremendous surpluses which are developing in the inventory problems which we face.

Grain is piling up at a tremendous rate. We are going to have an inventory after the take-over of the loan program somewhere between 500 and 550 million bushels of wheat. The same is true of corn and of cotton. If we have acreage allotments and marketing quotas on these crops, which represent about half the nation's total crop acreage, will farmers turn to more dairy cows, poultry and other livestock in an effort to supplement their incomes? If so, how will that affect Vermont farmers?

I am not going to follow up that line of thinking now because I understand that E. M. (Mike) Norton will go into that later at this meeting. My only point in mentioning the subject is that we are in another period of great change and challenging problems. The programs and procedures that served us in the struggle out of the depressing years of the early thirties, and those that met our needs for increasing production since 1942, will require a lot of change and adjustment if we are to deal successfully with the problems of today and those that lie ahead.

A COUNTY AGENT LOOKS AT ACP

Address by Ralph McWilliams, Franklin County Agent
at Vermont State PMA Conference
Burlington, Vermont, May 28, 1953

I have enjoyed listening to the preceding speakers and surely they have given us a great deal of good information on which to do our thinking about PMA, and if I can add anything to this, if I can speak a little bit to you on the subject that has been assigned to me, I will be very glad to give what I can.

Ever since Mr. Heald asked me if I would be on the program I have been a little bit in the position of the housewife who decided that on such and such a date they will have soup for dinner, and so I have been gathering up this, that and the other thing and putting it into the pot and stirring it up and adding a little water, (I'm afraid a good bit of water), trying to thin it down, and I'm not too sure what is going to be ladled up. There are a lot of things in there, and a lot of things that I have thought about, that I would like to be able to express about my view of this ACP program.

You'll know as well as I will when I get through, maybe better, whether or not I have gotten some of those feelings of mine across. I recognize that I come into the picture at a very unfortunate time, between a well-spoken man from our southern State of Virginia, and your lunch hour, which is an opportune time for anybody to get up and disappear, but I didn't draw up the program, I merely am helping to take part in it.

Let me say a little bit first of all about county agents, old stuff to you folks, I'm sure, and yet I think that we county agents, and possibly you folks, need to be reminded once in a while of what we are and what we are supposed to be occupied with.

Going back to the original history of the Act, which set up the Extension Service, it comes as near to describing what Extension work is supposed to do as anything, I guess, ever has, and fortunately for us they have never limited too much what we could say or what we could do or how we could carry on our work. I think it's in the history or Act where it says that Extension work is to "aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics and to encourage the application of the same," -- a good broad application -- and we have been back and forth on this, all of us Extension workers, for a great many years. Someone came along in connection with the Land Grant College work and they tried to itemize it a little bit more and some of the items that they put down were "to improve farm earnings, to improve standards of living, to improve social life, to develop leadership, develop opportunities for boys and girls to acquire vocational training, to teach cooperation, improve health and rural life, maintain soil fertility," and of course do everything possible to promote good farm practices. I expect that if they had kept on they could have thought of a few more things, giving a broad field with which to work.

We do try, I think, all of us county agents, to consider the importance of these various programs that come along and certainly to try to evaluate their importance to our particular constituents, our particular county and our particular group. Again I quote some of the text of the program and that is, "Will it stabilize or increase farm income? Will it increase efficient use of resources? Will it tend to stabilize economy? Is it administered

in the public welfare, and will it improve the distribution of income?" Again, pretty broad, a big enough umbrella for practically anyone to get under. I was just making a little canvass this morning and I find that I am the only county agent in Vermont more or less active at the present time, who has been associated with the ACP program from the start and consequently some of the things I may say, the other county agents can't quibble about because they weren't there. I think they were all born at the time, but I'm not even sure of that.

The original ACP program, as you all know very well, followed the Triple A program which was to a considerable extent one of limitation of production in the effort to adjust production to consumption. We were at that time in a good deal the same situation as we are now; in fact, at that time there was a depression. But we were in somewhat the same situation that we are working into apparently now and which the Administrator spoke about, this problem of unwieldy surpluses which somehow or other have got to be used. I think I appreciate what he said when he said that anyone who had a good solution to that could probably be the Secretary of Agriculture, but I don't think there would be too many applicants for the job for that particular purpose, and it would seem to me to be one of the original purposes of the ACP program, set up more or less without intent to be an aid to production or aid to soil conservation and improving fertility and things of that kind. Still it seems to me that one of the essential elements in it was to get money into the hands of farmers and some of us know that payments were made for practices which were of very questionable value for any other reason. They did give us ground work on which we county agents could do a little more educational work, but they did have a considerable part in there of providing for ways of building up farmers' incomes.

Then there was a second stage, and these divisions are strictly my own, when the very real concern was one of soil building and soil improvement, and as I was looking over the summary for the State of Vermont as it applies to Franklin County, there has been, since way back at the beginning of the program, a very real amount of work done in soil building and soil improvement. The variations in the amount of some of the materials used for soil building and soil improvement purposes haven't changed in any remarkable extent from those first years up to the present time, except as I think they varied more according to the amount of money available for the program. There seemed to be about the same amount of farmer interest in that particular phase of the whole program as there is now and indicates, if it indicates anything in that respect, that the farmers themselves have a continuing interest in soil building and soil improvemont that is aided very materially by this program.

The third period was the period of the war when we were interested almost exclusively in the matter of maximum production regardless of almost any other consideration and I think that there was actually demonstrated then the value of much of the work that was done in the preceding phases of this program.

The fourth stage was post-war and the rebuilding of the depleted soil resources, to building up food and fiber reserve which also had been considerably depleted at that time. Now apparently we are entering another phase where the question is back where we started, back in 1936. What are we going to do with the surplus and how are we going to keep up farmers' incomes in the process? I have jotted down quite a few notes here and I

am not going to use them all because of limitations of time and your patience and my own capacity. I do want to point out some things that may have already been touched on this morning and that Gay Baldwin just referred to in one of the questions that he had; the question of what we have done in practices with the money that has been allotted to this State and particularly to Franklin County. I have looked over the statistics for the United States and find that around 40% of the ACP money has gone into materials -- lime and fertilizer. In the State of Vermont and in Franklin County, it's been right around 90% that has gone into these two helps. I think it is perfectly logical that that should be the case because our soil need was very much greater for rebuilding than was the case of the country as a whole. If you want anything to substantiate that all you need to do is to look at the fertilizer sales statistics for the United States. They are just beginning, even now, to use fertilizer in the middle west and surprisingly enough they are finding it profitable to do it. That isn't going to cut down production. They are going to go ahead and use it, program or no program. But, in the process of years over which they were depleting their soils without thought of fertility reserves, we had to compete with them. We had done that same thing years previously to our soils, and our farmers, in an effort to compete with these richer soils of the middle west, were forced to still further exhaust the fertility resources of our soils without getting compensating income that would enable the individual farmers to rebuild them or even keep them up to a reasonable level as they went along. So that when the ACP program came along and today also, we have a much greater and much more important program of restoring fertility than any of the other areas in the country and when we come to the 1952 figures for Franklin County, I think 89% of the ACP money spent in that county went for lime and fertilizer.

The other practices which were important were, in second place, land clearing, and in third place various phases of the drainage problems or water control or whatever you want to call it. Some people might say SCS projects, but especially the ones that had to do with control of the water.

The forestry practices were next in importance and showed about 1½% of the county PMA funds were used for tree planting, woodland and sugar bush improvement.

For the whole period of the ACP program in Franklin County, that is from 1936 down to the present time, the outstanding practice was the use of lime, and the records show more than 130,000 tons of lime used which totals up to more than one ton per acre of the cropland of the county. Of course, some land had several tons and much of it had none, but 130,000 tons have made a very appreciable improvement in our basic soil structure.

Second in importance was the superphosphate, which in terms of 20% material, added up to 60,000 tons reported under the program. This again is approximately one-half ton per acre of our cropland over the 17-year period.

These certainly are basic to any soil building and soil improvement structure and have made some progress to restoring to fertility that, through force of necessity, was drained out of our Franklin County soils when our farm people were competing with the rich soil farther west.

From the years 1947 to 1952 there have been 116 acres of trees set out, 185 acres of woodland improved and 2300 acres of land cleared. That is under the ACP program. Now that 2300 acres of land cleared is quite a percentage of land when it comes right down to it. Some of it may not have been done using the best judgment in the world, but it was all aimed to do for stony land the same thing that drainage does for wet land; that is, to make it usable, to make it in condition so that the work farmers do can be of some economic value to the country. There were 173,000 cubic yards of material taken out of ditches for various drainage projects, and under the ACP program 192 ponds were built. Comparing these figures with the SCS boys on a more or less factual basis, it would appear that about 75% of the land cleared by SCS would be included under the ACP program. In other words, approximately 25% more than appears in ACP has been cleared and SCS has not done all of it either. The program has stimulated a great deal of land clearing that has not appeared on anybody's records except that of the individual farmer. The same thing is probably true when it comes to other things. About 60% of the ditching reported by SCS has been done under ACP. About 18% of the ponds that were dug were dug under ACP. Many people think that the only lime and fertilizer used in land improvement work is what is done under ACP. I don't know how you would get an actual picture of the total, but it is very much greater than any records would show, and that is no reflection on ACP. This, instead, is to be credited to ACP, that it has stimulated the individual farmer to appreciate the importance of many of these practices which otherwise he might not have had brought to his attention so early or so emphatically as was done through the advantages of the ACP program. There is going to be a lot more of it done. If ACP dropped out of the picture today there would be a great deal of it continued. It would be subject to the same weaknesses which have a tendency to sneak into the ACP program itself, that is that too much of this project, and I say too much when I think about the welfare of the whole area, too much of this has a tendency to get into the operations of the larger farm units.

The intense management, the good crop systems, are not necessarily distributed over the ones that need it the most or could make the greatest use of it. These things all have their bearing on production and right now ACP, Green Pastures, and I don't know how many other things, are being cursed more or less loudly by some farmers because they have stimulated production to the extent that they have ruined the milk price. I don't know. Maybe you'd guess from this that the Secretary of Agriculture could solve that question. It is a real problem, but talking about it and finding fault with it isn't going to change that particular situation, now or in the foreseeable future. It's in there and it's in there as just a part of over-all farm economics.

Now we can talk about ACP and on the basis of what ACP has done for Franklin County and for Vermont items that I know about is an accomplishment that I don't think could ever be over-credited. I don't think it will ever be blown up to greater value, apparent value, than it's worth, because all of you men who lived before 1932 know the situation on a lot of farms as applied to fertility and to crop production, and how economically difficult it was for many of those farms to operate. ACP has come along and done a magnificent job in this one respect. SCS has, in the last couple of years, cooperated, (that isn't exactly the word I want to use although they have done that) assisted is the word I want to use, but they have helped along with the ACP program. They have provided technical assistance that has made some of these practices much more effective than they otherwise would be. There

has been the assistance that we have had in the last two years from the Forest Service which I think is definitely arousing much greater appreciation of the value of our forest land and the use to which it could be put.

Over these same years we have had various changes in farm finance which in themselves have been particularly important. The Production Credit, the Farm Credit, the Farmers Home Administration, all those things have served in building up certain elements, certain segments of our agriculture. It has seemed to me more and more, as I have looked at these things, that we often mistake one particular fact or one particular statement for the whole problem.

The whole problem that we have here in Vermont agriculture and need to meet is to make the farm unit a self-complete entity that will maintain the fertility of the land, the efficient feeding of people off the land, the maintaining of the good environment for the farm family. We have been using SCS, Forestry, ACP and Extension, and have always done it more or less successfully with a "shot-gun" method. Change the practices and you have done something is true, but it always is nibbling around the edges. What apparently is much more important, if someone could devise a way to put it into effect, is the sitting down with the farm family and analyzing the individual farm from all the different angles; what it needs in the way of soil fertility, what it needs in the way of adequate liming, what it needs in the way of production credit, what the farmer and his family need in the way of living conditions, and analyzing, writing down, if possible, or at least talking through with the farm family the possibilities for that particular unit and where they might expect to get under certain given conditions which are possible in that set-up. That is the end that I think we are all working for but we still, it seems to me, are doing it on a piecemeal basis which is not anything more than a piecemeal operation, and working in ACP, so I see it as a very valuable part of making and putting a sound structural floor under the farm business. What we need to supplement that, or rather to make that fully valuable, is to somehow establish an economic program and an economic floor as well under those individual farm units.

I appreciate the opportunity of being here with you today. I do not mean the opportunity of speaking, but I do appreciate the opportunity of meeting with you. Thank you.

THE DAIRY SITUATION

Address by E. M. Norton, Director, Dairy Branch,
at the Vermont State PMA Conference,
Burlington, Vermont, May 28, 1953

When he invited me to talk to you here today, Mr. Heald suggested that you would be interested in, among other things, the future course of milk prices, industry self-help programs, and the problems of handling and disposing of present stocks of dairy products. Actually these questions involve just about the whole dairy situation.

The future trend in milk prices, of course, will be influenced by developments in both production and demand conditions as well as by Government programs.

The year 1952 may have been a turning point in milk production. Total production in 1952 approximated the average of the last 10 years, a 7-year decline in the number of milk cows being nearly offset by rising production per cow. During 1952, however, the number of milk cows increased 3 percent and at the beginning of 1953 farmers had on hand more dairy heifers than a year earlier. The decline in beef prices discouraged culling of milk cows at the heavy rate of recent years.

The increase in the number of milk cows, the relatively mild winter, and the liberal feed supplies and heavy feeding in most areas, resulted in milk production during the last 5 months at a rate about 7 percent greater than a year earlier.

Barring drought conditions, the present prospects appear to be for milk production to continue in 1953 somewhat above a year ago although few people expect it to continue to show as much of a percentage increase as in recent months.

The recent increase in milk production has been general throughout the Nation and in both fluid milk and manufacturing milk areas.

On the demand side of the picture we find fairly good demands for most dairy products except for butter and cream. Fluid milk consumption in Federal order markets during the last year has been slightly greater than a year earlier. Cheese and ice cream consumption have been up moderately. On the other hand the demand for butter and fluid cream have been unfavorable.

Looking into the immediate future it appears that there will be ample milk supplies for all uses at prices near the present support level and the Federal order prices, and it probably will be necessary to take some supplies off the market under the price support program.

We know that the announced price support program will maintain a floor under farm prices of manufacturing milk and butterfat through next March. We know also that Federal orders will establish minimum prices to producers for milk in some 49 fluid milk markets.

At the same time, in view of the prospective milk production and demand conditions and the fact that the Department now has substantial price support stocks of dairy products available for sale back to the domestic market, we see little prospect of more than a moderate seasonal rise in prices of milk and its products through next winter.

Looking further into the future our crystal ball becomes dimmer. The course of dairy prices will depend more on the longer time developments in general economic conditions, production and prices of other agricultural commodities, developments with respect to so-called imitation dairy products and imports, as well as the future price support policy and programs.

The Agricultural Act of 1949 requires the support of prices to farmers for milk and butterfat at such level between 75 and 90 percent of parity as is necessary to assure an adequate supply. It prescribes that such support shall be carried out by loans on, or purchases of, dairy products.

Prices were supported at 90 percent of parity during the 1952-53 marketing year. Production and consumption appeared to be about in balance until late 1952. The industry stored dairy products as usual during the spring and summer months of flush production for winter markets. However, with the unexpectedly heavy production during the winter months, total supplies exceeded current consumption.

Price support purchases for the marketing year ending March 31, 1953, totaled 143 million pounds of butter, 75 million pounds of cheese, and 212 million pounds of nonfat dry milk solids.

The price support level for the marketing year beginning April 1, 1953, was one of the first and most difficult decisions confronting Secretary Benson when he took office. The Secretary had the responsibility under the law of assuring an adequate supply of milk and its products. The quantities of dairy products purchased under the support program during the last marketing year were equivalent to only about 3 percent of the total milk supply. Yet these quantities constituted serious disposal problems.

We can offer price support stocks of dairy products for sale back into the domestic market only at prices that will not interfere with the current support program. We are offering the supplies at prices moderately above our current purchase prices but the prospects of sale are not bright.

We are donating and distributing supplies to school lunch programs and welfare agencies.

We have offered supplies of butter to the Army at prices competitive with prices of other spreads.

We have made nonfat dry milk solids available for donation to welfare agencies for relief uses abroad.

We have sold a moderate quantity of nonfat dry milk solids at less than cost to charitable organizations for welfare uses in foreign countries. We have not yet offered to sell butter and cheese at less than cost to foreign governments and international agencies and other organizations for shipment overseas as we did in disposing of part of the stocks acquired in 1949 and 1950.

After consulting with representatives of the dairy industry, Congress, and the President, the Secretary extended the price support for milk and butterfat at 90 percent of parity for another year with the understanding and expectation that the industry would immediately begin developing more satisfactory solutions to the dairy problem. For this purpose he called together some 90 representatives of the dairy industry in early April. A smaller task group met May 11 to study further the ideas and suggestions developed by the larger group.

The Secretary of Agriculture prescribed no limits or guides concerning recommendations and proposals to be considered except to suggest that they give particular attention to action by the industry itself aimed at expanding the markets for milk and its products so that price support purchases could be reduced to a minimum and the industry would free itself insofar as possible from dependence upon Government price supports.

The principal recommendations of the task group were a return as soon as possible to the principle of flexible price supports for all agricultural commodities at the end of the current marketing year, full sales promotion by the industry, and further consideration of the possibility of developing outlets for present stocks of dairy products, including possible plans for moving such stocks into American consumer channels and in undernourished areas of the world.

If the present legislation continues in effect, the milk and butterfat price support level during the marketing year beginning April 1, 1954, will be somewhere between 75 and 90 percent of parity at the beginning of such marketing year. Secretary Benson has made it quite clear that the dairy industry has a transition year to come up with some better ideas than the continuation of supports at the maximum level authorized by law if such continued support would involve large purchases of dairy products.

Another factor that may have an increasing influence on the course of dairy prices in the long run is the use of vegetable oils in place of milk fat. All of us know the inroad into the butter market of margarine. Sales of margarine spurted upward after the removal of the tax on colored margarine and exceeded sales of butter in 1952. The end of this replacement is not in sight.

The use of vegetable oils in place of milk fat in other products is more than a remote future threat. It is a reality in several States where the sale of so-called imitation dairy products is permitted. Sales of imitation ice cream and filled evaporated milk are reaching significant volumes in these States.

There appear to be wide differences of opinion within the industry as to what should and can be done in this matter. The Federal Filled Milk Act prohibits interstate shipment of fluid, dried and condensed milks containing vegetable oil. The Filled Cheese Act places a small tax on filled cheese and prescribes certain packaging and labeling requirements. State laws and regulations vary widely and some of them are weak or vague. It is the laws and regulations, rather than the technical problems, that are holding in check the appearance of filled cream and filled fluid milk in the markets.

Another problem in regard to the future course of milk prices in the U.S. relates to imports of dairy products. Historically our imports generally have been equivalent to less than one percent of our milk production and they have consisted mainly of cheese. Imports were even smaller during World War II when we supplied substantial quantities of dairy products to our allies.

Dairy production has increased substantially in many foreign countries since World War II and the exporting countries have shipped more dairy products to the United States.

Since August 1951 we have controlled imports of certain dairy products under Section 104 of the Defense Production Act. At the present time we are prohibiting imports of butter, nonfat dry milk solids, dried whole milk, dried cream and dried buttermilk and are restricting to quotas the imports of certain types and varieties of cheese.

These controls were imposed because there was evidence that imports would have sharply increased in the absence of controls, and increased imports would have interfered with the price support program, resulted in greater Government purchases under the program, and intensified the disposal problem.

Section 104 expires on June 30. However, the Secretary of Agriculture has advised the President that he has reason to believe that, in the absence of import controls after June 30, dairy products will be imported in such volumes that they will interfere with the price support program and that action should be taken to control imports of dairy products pursuant to Sec. 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. In accordance with the procedure of Sec. 22, the President has directed the Tariff Commission to investigate the facts and recommend advisable action. The Tariff Commission held a hearing on the subject in early May.

We are more concerned with the potential volume of imports of dairy products than with the volume imported so far. Large quantities of dairy products are flowing in international trade. The principal foreign exporting countries exported in 1952 about 846 million pounds of butter and 682 million pounds of cheese. These exports were equivalent to about 1/2 of the butter, and 1/4 of the cheese produced in those exporting countries. Foreign countries also produced and exported large quantities of dried milk.

Prices of dairy products in the U.S. generally are higher than prices in most foreign markets by more than the present duties and transportation costs. If permitted, the diversion of only a moderate percentage of the supplies of dairy products in international trade to U.S. markets could have considerable influence on the future of dairying in this country.

By way of summary, it may be said that the present inclinations point to a fairly stable dairy price situation during the current marketing year, with prices to farmers continuing near present levels except for a moderate seasonal increase. While continued high milk production could result in an intolerable inventory position under the price support program, a moderate decrease in production, due to drought or other conditions, could return us to the comfortable position of selling price support stocks back to the domestic market as we did in late 1950.

Secretary Benson recognizes the potential effect of imports. In testifying before Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on April 9 he said, "I am sure that some effective means of controlling imports of agricultural commodities and products is absolutely essential to the success of many of this Department's programs..... The problem is not a temporary one; it will be with us as long as we have any programs that keep our domestic prices above the world level."

Trends beyond the present marketing year are less certain, since they will depend more on developments in general economic conditions and on agriculture as a whole, as well as future policies concerning price support and other marketing programs.

WORKING TOGETHER TO ACCOMPLISH OUR GOALS

Summary of comments made by A. R. Gray, Area Conservationist, at PMA Conference, Friday, May 29, 1953.

Since the SCS and the AC Program are closely related in the permanent-type practices as offered by the ACP, what will help you people will at the same time help us. I believe that better screening of individual farmer requests before they are sent to the local SCS technician is one of the very best ways in which we can be of mutual assistance. A careful screening, weeding out those in which there is no chance of performing the practice that year, is one of the ways that the amount of the 5% funds can be reduced.

Just before I close I would like to make the suggestion that perhaps in the future some system could be worked out whereby prior approval would be unnecessary. This system is roughly as follows: In the fall of each year after the construction season is over, the SCS technician in charge of operations in the county could send the ACP county committee a list of farms and practices performed that would qualify for ACP payment.

WORKING TOGETHER TO ACCOMPLISH OUR GOALS

Summary of comments made by A. W. Gottlieb, Deputy State Forester, at PMA Conference, Friday, May 29, 1953

The Vermont Forest Service will continue to cooperate in the ACP program in any way possible. The county foresters will continue to cooperate as in the past, both in planning at the county level and in field work within the limits of the time they have available.

In Rutland County we have found a consulting forester who is available to furnish service such as tree planting and woodlot improvement work, such as pruning, thinning and weeding, to owners desiring this type of service. Some use has been made of the service in the county, particularly in tree planting. If this type of service proves to be of use in furthering the program it may be possible to extend it to other counties. We will want to be sure the service is kept on a high plane and that the work is done well and at a reasonable cost.

In some cases county foresters have told us that it would help them to have definite funds set up for forestry work in the county. Apparently they have been in the position of telling farmers that they could receive assistance for forestry work if the funds were available but funds were only available if they were not used in other phases of the program. It would strengthen the hand of county foresters if they could tell farmers that definite assistance was available.

The Forest Service welcomes suggestions and comments from you people working in ACP. Committeemen working with farmers will find approaches for accomplishing work which will be valuable. We will be glad to have suggestions from you as to how we can better help you in furthering a program for the conservation of the natural resources of the state.

WORKING TOGETHER TO ACCOMPLISH OUR GOALS

Summary of comments made by R. P. Davison, County Agent Leader, at PMA Conference, Friday, May 29, 1953.

In the first place, it seems to me that we here in Vermont have very good working relationships between the various agencies interested in conservation, and we have had these relationships for a number of years. I see no reason why they will not continue in the future. Some examples of how we work together at the present time include:

1. County agents are ex-officio members of the county PMA committees by law, and the Extension Director is a member of the State PMA Committee by law.

2. County agricultural agents work closely with district supervisors and the Director of the Extension Service and the Dean of the College of Agriculture is a member of the State Soil Conservation Committee.

3. At the county level, Soil Conservation Service personnel and county agricultural agents work closely together in doing a well-rounded educational job in the field of conservation, and in helping farm people to understand thoroughly their farm plans, soils maps, etc.

I am sure that the Extension Service will continue to help all they can in developing good conservation programs in Vermont. With the PMA they will:

1. Continue educational work needed in connection with the ACP Program.

2. Assist with policy making in connection with the ACP Program at both the county and State levels.

3. Continue to give assistance through technical committees from the Extension Service and the College of Agriculture.

4. The Editorial Offices of the Extension Service will be available, as they have for the past several years, to assist with the informational program of the PMA and the ACP Programs.

I would like to repeat what I have said in other years to this same group, that I hope the PMA county committees and the county agents working together will work out plans for the best use of the time of the county agents. You all realize that the agricultural agents are very busy with several activities, and if their time in connection with the ACP Program and the PMA Program can be used in connection with policy matters, it will be greatly appreciated.

Looking at the over-all conservation job, I would say that the Extension Service will continue cooperating as we have in the past with:

1. The PMA in doing the ACP job.

2. We will step up our work with the Soil Conservation Service workers in getting a better understanding and use of farm plans and soils maps.

3. We will continue to cooperate with the Forest Services, both State and Federal to carry out a good educational program dealing with forestry conservation.

I feel that the best job of conservation will be done where the agency folks work the best together. It would be my guess that we in Vermont do this as well, and maybe better than in any other State.

WORKING TOGETHER TO ACCOMPLISH OUR GOALS

Comments made by Gerald Wheeler, U.S. Forest Service at State PMA Conference, May 29, 1953

Perhaps you wonder why a representative of the U.S. Forest Service is on this panel. Before I go into details regarding my participation I want to tell you something about my over-all responsibilities.

The U.S. Forest Service is actually charged with three major responsibilities. The first of these is cooperative work with the States in fire control, forest management practices on private land, and in the production of trees for forest planting. Under this heading the Forest Service contributes to the work of the States both in funds and with technical assistance and guidance. However, all of the work is done by and under the direction of the States and the Federal Government merely participates in paying a part of the bill. This is not a new program as the Forest Service has been cooperating in fire control work with Vermont since the passage of the Weeks Law in 1912.

The second responsibility of the Federal Forest Service is that of research. Scientific investigations are made to determine better uses of forest products as well as how to provide better management for our forest lands. The results of these studies are made available to the States and other public and private agencies.

The third branch of activity of the Federal Forest Service is that of National Forest administration. This is my main job and the major part of my time is directed to the administration and protection of the Green Mountain National Forest. Many of you know that as a result of legislation passed by the General Assembly in 1925, the Federal Government has from time to time been purchasing land in Vermont for the Green Mountain National Forest. Roughly, the defined area inside of which this land is being acquired commences at the north line of the town of Warren and extends south along the backbone of the Green Mountain Range to the Massachusetts line. There is a small stretch eliminated from this area comprising the stretch between the Mendon Mountain Road (Route U.S. 4) and Route 103A running east from Wallingford to E. Wallingford. The National Forest varies in width but averages about 12 miles East and West. To date, about 220,000 acres have been acquired within this area and it is administered as a going concern on the basis of multiple use. Our National Forest not only provides for water production and watershed protection but also for timber production, outdoor recreation and fish and game management. The income from Vermont's National Forest resulting from the cutting of mature and merchantable timber amounts to between $125 and $150 thousand a year. I am told that land owners selling stumpage in areas adjacent to the National Forest find that they are able to get better prices for their timber as a result of the prices bid for National Forest stumpage. I think I should also point out to you folks that 220,000 acres represents an area about the size of 10 Vermont towns. However, the area I administer is not in a compact unit but is in scattered tracts running up and down the State about 80 miles as the crow flies. In administering this property we have many of the problems that selectmen encounter in managing town affairs.

As you know, the U.S. Forest Service, together with the Soil Conservation Service and the State PMA Committee, are charged with the responsibility of recommending the State program for ACP. I take these responsibilities seriously and in order that I can properly redeem them have attended 3 of your county meetings. I am also attending this meeting so that I can be in a reasonably good position to participate with the others in developing the State program.

From the material that has been made available to me during the past few weeks it appears to me that there is a trend toward more permanent practices in our ACP. While the program may not be entirely limited to permanent practices it appears that the tendency is in that direction. With this in mind I think that we might well direct some of our thinking in the communities toward better woodland management. Possibly, the county committeemen should ask themselves if they are stressing woodland management enough in their contacts with the community committeemen. Also, would it not be desirable for the community committeemen to stress all of the advantages of good woodland management in their farm-to-farm contacts. I think it has already been demonstrated here in Vermont that both the Federal and State Forest Services want to cooperate in every way possible in this ACP. I think it also should be borne in mind that cooperation is a two-way proposition. I wonder, if in years to come, you will find it desirable to consider woodland areas in the counties as part of the formula on which to make allotments.

I do not feel that I can close my statements before this group without indicating the wholehearted cooperation that forestry has always obtained from your State Director. He is intensely interested in forestry and its possible benefits to our farm woodlands. I have never had occasion to discuss a woodland problem with the State Committee without getting a very interested and sympathetic hearing. With the cooperative relationships the conservation agencies have here in Vermont it seems to me that we can look forward to continued conservation programs that will mean more each year to the farmers as well as to the general public.

WORKING TOGETHER TO ACCOMPLISH OUR GOALS

Note: At the time of preparing this report a complete digest of the comments made by Edson Gifford, State Soil Conservation Committee, had not been received. Therefore, they could not be included in this report.

SOME VERMONT PMA ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND CHALLENGES

Address by A. F. Heald, Vermont PMA Executive Officer
at Vermont State PMA Conference
Burlington, Vermont, May 29, 1953

I would like to consider this a report to you committeemen and others of what your organization has done over the years with particular emphasis to the 1952 program and to the Agricultural Conservation Program. I look at this as sort of a report from me as your Executive Officer to you as a Board of Directors.

Some History

The Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act was signed by President Roosevelt in February of 1936. As a result of this, a conference of County Agent Leaders and farmers was held in New York City on March 9, 10 and 11, 1936 to make plans for the development and administration of a program in the Northeast Region.

Secretary Wallace, following this conference, advised Dean Carrigan on March 18 that he was authorized to set up an organization in Vermont.

The first step was to set up a State Committee. He nominated four men - Ed Jones, Will Sinclair, Arthur Packard and George Bailey.

This committee met on April 2, 1936 for the first time in Morrill Hall to set up temporary plans for doing the job in Vermont and for recommending practices. Some of the original county committeemen nominated by this group of men who are still familiar to us were Tom Macauley, Ray Allen, Leon Brainerd, Howard Varney, Arthur Davison, Lawrence Marvin, Karl Field, Park Newton, Edson Gifford, Gay Baldwin and probably some others who are not in the record.

During that first year there were eight meetings held by the State Committee. They selected Harris Soule, County Agent Leader, to be Executive Officer and Ted Blondin was hired to be fieldman. This, then, was the start at the State level.

County Level

At the county level, the County Agent acted as Executive Officer for the program. Each county had an assistant known as a County Conservation Agent. The Extension Service provided office space and equipment at the State level and the county Farm Bureau at the county level. In return, AAA paid for some clerical assistance used by both. The County Agent continued to act as Executive Officer throughout 1936 and the appointed county committeemen continued to function. In 1937, the community committeemen were elected for the first time.

It was in 1938 that the community committeemen started in earnest to do the work of sign-up and checking. They have done it ever since.

In the early years, county association expenses were deducted from the farmer's check. They have run up as high as 10%.

Some State Committee Highlights

Here are some reports from some of the early State Committee meetings that will give you an idea of their problems in those days.

At a meeting in 1938, the Washington Office representative discussed the possibility of furnishing lime and superphosphate to ACP participants in lieu of payment. The State Committee agreed that this was a good idea and voted to furnish it. In 1938, the State Committee divided up the territory and held their first series of meetings with county and community committeemen. At the County Program Planning Meetings, it was reported that every county was in favor of payment for a seeding practice. It was reported that community committeemen generally felt that payment for potash was insufficient to encourage its use. During a discussion at one of the early meetings in 1938 or 1939, the Washington Office recommended that the practices in Vermont should consist of two; namely, furnishing lime and superphosphate. The State Committee was unanimously opposed to this and added practices for potash, seeding and woodland management.

The State Committee in 1938 stressed the use of superphosphate in the gutter and on dropping boards. This practice was beginning to catch on in importance.

June of 1939 - "There was agreement that the Agricultural Conservation Program in Vermont is sound on a long-time basis - that it provides an encouragement toward the use of lime and phosphorus that is so badly needed in Vermont, and that it decidedly affects the crop situation and the health of the livestock. It was agreed that it would be needed to keep up the amount of material used even if the price level was in better adjustment."

Some ACP Program Highlights - 1936

Practices set up in 1936 were designed to improve the fertility of hay and pasture land and to provide for improved woodland plus the mulching practice. Three hundred meetings were held in the State to acquaint farmers with the program. As a result, 5,702 farmers carried out practices in this first year.

1937

"The 1937 program featured 14 ways to conserve soil and qualify for payment in Vermont." These included mineral practices, seeding clover and alfalfa, growing small grains or annual grasses as green manure crops, mulching, excluding livestock, planting trees, improving woodland and building fences. The allowance was based on the acreage of cropland on the farm.

1938

The program was similar to 1937. In 1938, triple super was furnished for the first time. This started the furnished materials program.

1939

Participation was built up considerably in this year. There were about 14,000 farmers participating. The soil-building allowance again was based on the acreage of cropland, orchardland and pasture on the farm.

1940

In 1940, for the first time, practices under ACP were not tied in with acreage allotments. There was no deduction, in other words, for excess acreage allotments. The woodland rehabilitation allowance was set up in counties having hurricane damaged areas. This amounted to $60 which could be earned over and above any other allowance. In addition to this, each farm had a reforestation allowance amounting to $30. A practice for the construction of riprap was added to those offered in 1939.

In 1940, forest trees were furnished as Grant of Aid.

1941

Three new practices were added. They were seeding pasture mixtures, pasture improvement which consisted of clearing the land and removal of diseased and uneconomic apple trees.

1942

In 1942, we had our first printed Agricultural Conservation Handbook. Soilbuilding allowances continued to be based on the acreage of cropland. We continued to have a reforestation allowance of $15. Practices were about the same as they were in the previous year.

1943

Conditions of the war made it impossible for farmers to secure help in carrying out many of the practices, therefore, they were limited to seven - the minerals plus mulching, stripcropping and planting trees. Allowance was based on animal units plus cropland.

1944

This year the program was confined pretty much to production practices. It included just the minerals plus mulching.

In 1944, states for the first time were given allocations of money to run their own programs and it was pointed out that states would in the future still be given further responsibilities.

1945

In 1945, a single printed page was used for the practice handbook. It was very similar to the 1944 program and was limited to practices which would help conserve and produce.

So this picture - I won't go into any more years - shows you the fact that our program has been flexible and has gone up and down and has been changed with the needs of our country. Our people have been close to these needs and have been willing and able to make the necessary shifts.

War Board and Related Activities

At a State conference of county committeemen on July 30, 1940, State and county committees considered "Agriculture and National Defense." From this point on, assignments began to come to committees in connection with this job.

Cotton for making mattresses and comforters was released to the Surplus Marketing Administration. This project was fostered by the Extension Service and administered by the Home Demonstration Groups throughout the State. Orders for the cotton were handled by the AAA and released to the Extension Service. 3,714 families received mattresses. 5,288 mattresses were delivered, using up 270,000 pounds of cotton.

In October of 1941, it was decided that the AAA would be expected to make a farm survey and summary would be tabulated in the county offices.

The Office of Price Administration arranged to issue the necessary gasoline to State, county and community committeemen for carrying on their wartime activities.

The U.S.D.A. sponsored a feed wheat sales program in which 100,000,000 bushels of wheat owned by CCC were made available for purposes of aiding in the production of livestock and poultry. Vermont participated in this program.

State and county committees cooperated with the Extension Service in a "Farm Defense Program." Under this program, every farm in Vermont was contacted and urged to produce as much as they could for defense. Each farmer signed a pledge to assist in every way possible. Tabulations were made of the production plans of farmers for the coming year.

January 12, 1943 was declared Farm Mobilization Day when President Roosevelt by proclamation called on all farmers to mobilize and start a full-scale program drive for the greatest food supply in history. Vermont's communication system was used to bring this word to all farmers.

Farmers were asked to plant potatoes and to reach a goal of 4400 acres in Vermont for 1943. This was a 20% increase over the 1942 acreage. Incentive payments for potato growers were initiated in this year.

A paper on Selective Service procedure was prepared with Bob Davison and sent out to county committeemen.

To determine the availability of farm youths of working ages on farms in Vermont, the ACP committeemen made a youth survey at the same time the farm contacts were made.

Through the CCC, wheat, corn and soy bean meal were made available for livestock producers through the cooperation of the State Office.

In February of 1943, it was urged that all committeemen recognize food production needs at town meetings. Production goals were sent to them and they were urged to produce good home gardens.

The USDA War Board decided that the best way to help the farmers reach their goal was to visit every farm in the State and they asked AAA community committeemen to make this visit to (1) discuss with farmers the vital need for increased production, (2) help them plan to reach capacity production, (3) find out what assistance they needed to do the job.

In order that Vermont farmers would have no difficulty in selling their 1943 surplus potatoes, CCC purchased 58 carloads in Vermont. They were shipped for conversion into industrial alcohol.

Dairy Production Program

The War Food Administration announced the general provision of a Dairy Production Program which became effective October 1, 1943. This was designed to protect dairy farmers against increase in the price of dairy feed, and hay above the September 1942 levels. It was instituted instead of allowing a higher price of milk in the market. Payments continued through June of 1946. Counties averaged to process about 13,000 applications each pay period. The pay period varied from one month to three. During the period, 192,530 applications were reviewed by county committees. A total of 34,997,000 cwt. of milk was sold plus about 2,000,000 pounds of butterfat. The net payment to producers during the period was $20,477,000. The average payment to the producer was $106.36. The average administrative cost per payment, State and county, was 23¢. This represented 22% of the amount paid.

Other Activities

The State Committee assisted in the program of bringing 150 Newfoundlanders into the State to work on dairy farms.

The State Committee continued to distribute wheat, corn and soy bean meal.

A Feed Advisory Committee was set up during 1944.

A 1944 food production campaign was continued. Farm machinery rationing was handled by the State and county committees. The dairy production payments were continued throughout the year. The State received a quota of farm machinery. A campaign was run during this year to get more milk in November. Much publicity was given to it and farm-to-farm contacts were made. Joint meetings of AAA county committees and potato subcommittees with the USDA County War Boards were held. They discussed the potato situation and the Potato Price Support Program of the Government. The potato loan program was in full swing. "More Milk in November Handbook for AAA Community Committeemen" was prepared and committeemen visited every farm to explain the program.

During 1945 the State Office continued to handle the facilitation and transfer and distribution of feedstuff, certification of canners, freezer locker plants, priorities, building permits and supplies, Farm Transportation Program, farm machinery supplies and potato program.

A survey was made because of drought conditions and as a result of these conditions, it was recommended that an emergency increase of 10¢ a hundredweight be made in the dairy production payments.

Feed Wheat and Oil Seed Meal Program

During the feed crisis, approximately 415,000 bushels of wheat, 850 tons of soy bean meal and 330 tons of oil seed meal were shipped into Vermont to help relieve the situation.

Beef Production Program

In June of 1945, the AAA announced the Beef Production Program, beginning in May of 1945 and ending June 30, 1946. The purpose of this was to encourage greater beef production. Some payments were made in Vermont.

There was also a sheep and lamb production program during the period August 5, 1945 to June 30, 1946.

The AAA acted in the disposal of surplus war supplies to farmers.

A conference was held in the Waterman Building on December 4 and 5 of 1944 to line up 1945 production goals.

1946

In 1946, the Office of Supply, headed by Harry Watling, was combined with the PMA State Office. The Office of Supply at the time of the combination had nine people on their payroll. They had been forced to reduce to six and four of these were transferred to the PMA State Office.

We continued to administer the ACP Program, the work of the former Office of Supply, the Dairy Production Program, the sheep and lamb and meat production payments, construction and priority permits and preference ratings for farm machinery.

During the fall of 1945, 66 carloads of surplus potatoes were sent to Vermont for the Livestock Feeding Program. This was an experimental program to see if they were suitable for livestock feed.

USDA Council

Memorandum 1132 issued by Clinton Anderson, dated October 1945, announced the termination of USDA War Boards and established USDA Councils. L. J. Peet was selected as Chairman of the new USDA Council and H. W. Soule as Secretary.

Vermont Emergency Food Campaign

Secretary Anderson appointed Mr. Soule as Director of the Famine Relief Program for Vermont. Through Mr. Soule's efforts, Mr. Fiorello LaGuardia, Director General of the new NRA was secured for the first meeting of this group which was held in the Waterman Building on April 4, 1946. Mr. LaGuardia appealed to American farmers to sell their wheat to the Government for shipment abroad. In order to reach people all over the State, Mr. Heald, Chairman of the Public Relations Committee for Farm Emergency Relief, contacted churches of all denominations and furnished them with literature and asked their assistance in making April 28, 1946 "Famine Sunday." "A Share Abundance Week" was carried out in Vermont during May. A goal of $50,000 was set to be raised to send foodstuff across.

Agricultural Mobilization

In more recent years, the PMA has been called on to help in the Agricultural Mobilization Program. Most of you in the room are familiar with this program. It includes work on production goals, Selective Service, priorities, Family Farm Policy Review, helping to sell bonds, farm labor, Civilian Defense and scrap drives.

Agricultural Resources

Memorandum 1278 issued by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan urged the consolidation of agencies and established an Agricultural Resources Program. Vermont was one of the first states to get complete county reports on this program.

Cooperation with Others

Under this heading, we have tried as an organization to work with many others. Our efforts include cooperation of the following:

1. Green Pastures Program
2. Forest Festival
3. Conservation Work Shops
4. E. H. Jones Maple Contest
5. Milk Marketing Program
6. NENYIAC

Developing Community Leaders

It has been said - and I believe it is true - that one of the greatest contributions of the PMA or ACP Program has been the development of local leaders by making them work. They were given the responsibility, took it and they did the job. I think that can be said without question of debate since the records speak for themselves. How many leaders we have developed and how much further we have made conservation go will be a matter of history, but I am sure that one of our greatest contributions has been the development of State, county and community leadership.

Acreage Allotment Program

The potato goal program started in 1938. Goals were set for commercial growers growing three acres or more and were determined by the county committees based on acreage history. The rate of payment was determined by compliance with established goals similar to that used for cotton, corn, tobacco, etc. A rate of deduction was taken from any payment otherwise due under the ACP for each acre or fraction in excess of the goal.

In 1938, 246 farms in the State were given a total allotment of 1678.8 acres.

In 1942, 2225.5 acreage allotments were given to 267 farms, and farmers were given a small incentive payment to encourage them to plant as near their allotment as possible.

In 1943, the Steagall Amendment provided for a Price Support Program. That fall, we had a potato storage problem and eligible growers were allowed potato loans under which they could sell their potatoes at support price and repay the loan, or, if potatoes could not be sold at support price, the potatoes could be turned over to CCC in repayment of the loan. This type of program continued until the 1950 crop had been harvested.

Price Support Activities

Potatoes

Because of a large surplus of potatoes suitable for livestock feeding purposes the Potato Price Support Program was carried on in Vermont from the 1945 crop year through the 1950 crop year.

In 1945, no supplies were purchased from local farmers in the State, however, 66 carloads were delivered from out-of-State sources for livestock feeding purposes. Following are some figures on purchases and sales of potatoes for livestock feeding purposes for the crop years 1946 through 1950:

Crop Year	Purchases from Local Sources in Vermont	Sales from Out-of-State Sources
1946	75,317 cwt.	389,817 cwt.
1947	5,860 cwt.	138,765 cwt.
1948	181,122 cwt.	297,580 cwt.
1949	169,383 cwt.	354,447 cwt.
1950	129,575 cwt.	16,440 cwt.

Apples

Due to an abundant apple crop, the Apple Purchase Program was carried on in Vermont for the crop years 1949, 1950 and 1951.

25,860 bushel boxes of apples were purchased from Vermont apple growers in 1949, 53,920 bushels in 1950 and 26,299 bushels in 1951.

These apples were delivered to Vermont schools and institutions and shipped to schools, institutions, hospitals, etc. out of State.

SOME CHALLENGES

Where do we go from here? What's ahead for us? I think that the State Committee's conclusions on this are good to pass along to everyone. They are this: "Do your everyday assignments and do them well. The work you do then will speak for itself."

Here are some specific things which I think we can all work on:

1. We can work toward more effective county committee meetings.

2. More effective community committeemen. I am sure that there are some good ones, but we can go a long way in improving community committee farm visits.

3. Coordinating our activities with others.

4. Developing a sound Agricultural Conservation Program that can withstand all attacks. If we believe the goal is toward more permanent type practices, then work toward those. If, on the other hand, we are sure that the practices we now offer are right, we must substantiate them with facts and figures and by getting on our feet and supporting them.

5. A little closer county office administration. For example, I think we get a little lenient sometimes on our sales slips and on our records and Reports of Performance. County committees will have to look at this job carefully and make sure they don't approve any payments that aren't in order.

6. Let people know that we are proud of our program.

If we do all this and do it well, we will have done a good job.

Practices Carried Out on Vermont Farms
ACP 1936-1952 (inclusive)*

Lime	1,128,438 tons
Super (16% equivalent)	498,946 tons
Potash (50% equivalent)	43,003 tons
Mulching	15,888 tons
Planting Trees	5,351 acres
Improving Woodland	8,884 acres
Fencing	59,252 rods
Clearing Land ('41-'52)	23,207 acres
Open Ditches ('47-'52)	665,364 cu. yds.
Tile Drains ('47-'52)	64,699 lin. ft.
Diversion Ditches ('49-'52)	6,822 rods
Riprap ('40-'52)	19,110 sq. yds.
Farm Ponds ('50-'52)	315 ponds
Hurricane Clean-up ('39-'40)	30,000 acres
Seedings - clover ('36-'40)	127,289 acres
alfalfa ('37-'40)	18,154 acres

*Note: Since 1952 statistics are not complete these figures are tentative and subject to change.

Vermont State PMA Office

PMA STATE CONFERENCE
Burlington, Vermont
May 28-29, 1953

Program Planning Recommendations - 1954 Agricultural Conservation Program

The committee on program planning submits the following recommendations for the consideration of the full conference. For convenience, these recommendations are listed as nearly as possible in the order in which they were taken up at the county meetings.

Background Statement

These recommendations are based upon a series of county meetings which were held in every county in Vermont and were attended by community and county committeemen and technical people. The delegates at this conference had the county recommendations with them and gave full consideration to them.

Importance of Minerals to Conservation

In making these recommendations, we want to point out to the Secretary of Agriculture that we have reviewed very carefully the recommendations contained in ACP Memorandum 5 and supplemental momoranda. We understand thoroughly the importance of permanent type practices. We further understand the public support for these types of practices. We do, however, want to make it very clear to everyone concerned that a conservation program for this area must include practices for minerals.

We believe very definitely that liming is a must for the practices in Vermont. Our college, our Experiment Station, our Extension Service, the Soil Conservation Service and all of our groups are behind this practice and point out that it is very definitely a permanent type practice for Agriculture. We therefore want to make it very emphatic that a practice for lime must be included in the 1954 program.

In addition to this, we believe that superphosphate used with manure is basic to Vermont agriculture. We submit that, by using it with manure, you conserve nitrogen, you get the farmer to make better use of the manure and you get a balanced fertilizer.

In addition to this, the mixed fertilizer practice is essential to our agriculture. By the using of lime, super and mixed fertilizer, we are convinced that you can establish better sod in our grassland form of farming and thereby prevent the work of additional permanent type practices at a later date. In other words, the expenditure of funds now to use minerals to keep the land in good condition means we won't have to patch it up later on.

We submit that one of the very real contributions of the ACP program in our area and in our State has been the work of community committeemen in their farm-to-farm contact. They have really been selling conservation. To this end, we strongly recommend that it be possible for committeemen to continue to make farm-to-farm visits to explain the program to farmers in this State.

Recommendations on Specific Practices - Part I

A. Recommended Practices as Per ACP Memo 5

1. A-2. Constructing diversion terraces, ditches, or dikes to intercept runoff and divert excess water to protected outlets.

The group recommends this practice with the inclusion of obstruction removal where necessary and recommend a payment of 50% of the average cost.

2. A-3. Constructing outlets, chutes, drop spillways, or drop inlets for channel or gully protection and to dispose of excess water without causing erosion.

The group does not recommend this to be included in the State handbook, but believe that counties should be given an option to offer it under the special practice provision.

3. A-4. Constructing erosion control or sediment retention dams to prevent or heal gullying and to retard or reduce runoff of water.

The group does not recommend this to be included in the State handbook, but believe that counties should be given an option to offer it under the special practice provision.

4. A-5. Establishing permanent sod waterways to dispose of excess water without causing erosion.

The group favors this practice and recommends that it should include the removal of obstructions where necessary. They recommend a payment of 50% of the average cost.

5. A-8. Establishing permanent vegetation to stabilize and protect gullies, dams, dikes, levees, diversion ditches, drainage ditches, and field border.

The group recommends this practice and recommends payment of 50% of the average cost.

6. A-9. Initial establishment of improved permanent pasture for runoff and erosion control on noncropland by seeding, sodding or sprigging perennial grasses, perennial legumes, or mixtures of legumes and perennial grasses.

The group voted to pass over this practice since they did not think it applied in Vermont.

7. A-12. Establishing contour stripcropping on nonterraced land.

The group passed over this practice with the thought that it could be offered as a special county practice.

8. A-15. Stream bank or shore protection, channel clearance, enlargement or realignment, or constructing floodways, levees, or dikes, to prevent erosion or flood damage to farm land.

The group favored this practice with a payment of 50% of the actual cost.

9. B-1. Planting, interplanting, or replanting trees or shrubs on farm land for windbreaks, shelter belts, erosion control or watershed protection.

The group favored this practice if amended to include planting for forestry purposes. The rate of payment should be based on 50% of the average cost.

10. B-2. Improving a stand of forest trees.

The group voted to approve this practice reworded to include: "Approved technical forestry advice and standards must be utilized. No assistance will be given under this practice on any acreage on which assistance under this practice was given under a previous program within five years". The recommended rate of payment is 50% of the actual cost not to exceed $15.00 per acre.

11. B-3. Construction of permanent fences to protect farm woodland from grazing. (Note: This practice was not included in Memo 5)

The group recommended to approve this practice with a payment rate of 50% of the average cost.

12. C-4. Constructing, enlarging, or sealing dams, pits, or ponds for livestock water to obtain proper distribution of livestock to prevent overgrazing.

The group voted to favor this practice and its payment should be 50% of the average cost.

13. E-1. Constructing and enlarging permanent open drainage systems to dispose of excess water.

The group favored this practice and recommended a payment of 50% of the average cost.

14. E-2. Installing underground drainage systems to dispose of excess water.

The group favored this practice and recommended payment of 50% of the average cost.

15. E-3. Shaping or land grading to permit effective surface drainage.

The group agreed to pass over the practice with the idea that counties could offer it under the special practice provision if they so desired.

16. F-1. Special conservation practices.

The group favored this practice and recommended 50% of the average cost as a basis for payment.

B. Additional Practices Recommended

1. Liming.

Counties were unanimous in favoring this practice and agreed that it should be worded as in 1953 and that the Government should pay 50% of the average cost of the material delivered to the counties on a county-to-county basis.

They further pointed out that this should be considered as a permanent type practice. They agreed that lime should be furnished based on soil tests.

2. Superphosphate.

The group was unanimous in approving this practice. They agreed that the use of super should be tied in with manure and that the details of the wording should be worked out with Dr. Midgley. They recommended a rate of payment of 40% of the cost.

3. Mixed fertilizer and potash.

The group favored this practice and agreed that it should be worded as in 1953. They recommended that payment be based on one-third of the cost.

The group favored some kind of soil testing to go along with this practice. The majority favored not furnishing this practice on farms that were not using lime where they could not show by soil tests that they did not need lime.

4. Land clearing.

The group favored this practice as in 1953. They recommended that the payment be 50% of the average cost with no payment when the cost was less than $20.00 per acre.

5. Green manure and cover crops.

The group favored this practice as in 1953 with a payment of $2.50 an acre.

6. Mulching.

The group favored the practice as in 1953 with a payment of $5.00 per ton.

7. Boron.

The group favored this practice as offered in 1953.

8. The group recommended that the following practice be included in the National Handbook:

   C-1. "Controlling competitive plants and shrubs necessary to acquire adequate vegetative cover for soil protection on meadow and pasture land. The practice must be performed in accordance with the provisions of an approved land use plan. Payment should be 50% of the actual cost".

Operating Policies - Part II

A. The committee was emphatic in their recommendations that farm-to-farm visits be used for enrolling farmers in the program.

B. The counties recommended that more training be given to community committeemen on the use of SCD farm plans. They further urged that committeemen make full use of the plan when visiting the farm.

C. The counties recommended that the policy followed in 1953 for breaking down the use of program funds among farmers be continued for 1954.

D. The group agreed that assistance will be given only for practices which are requested by the farmer before performance is started.

E. The group voted that the allowance be set up as in 1953 with a minimum and maximum established.

F. It is not feasible to report performance by seasons in Vermont.

G. The program funds should be broken down by counties as they were in 1953.

H. Prior approval of practice substitution was approved by the group. They went on record as recommending that, in the case of superphosphate and mixed fertilizer, a man be allowed a payment on the superphosphate used in mixed fertilizer even though he had not been approved for a mixed fertilizer practice.

   The group agreed that the method to be used in furnishing conservation materials, that is, whether it is contract or purchase order, be left up to the counties.

I. On the question as to the establishing of average rates, whether they should be established at the State level or the county level, the group recommended that they be established as they were in 1953. This means that, in the case of lime, the rate be established on the basis of the county's average rate and, in the case of all other average rates, it be based on the State's average rate.

J. The full conference added the following: We recommend the continuation of the Small Payment Increase. We believe that as it is used in Vermont it buys conservation on small farms.

Respectfully submitted,

L. Earl Wilson, Jr.

For the Program Planning Committee

L. Earl Wilson, Chairman
B. Frank Myott, Vice Chairman
Almon F. Heald, Secretary

Other members of the Program Planning Committee

Howard A. Foster, Addison County
Clyde H. Bryant, Bennington County
Arthur Messier, Caledonia County
G. N. Baldwin, Chittenden County
Geo. R. Ramsay, Essex County
B. Frank Myott, Franklin County
Ernest G. Prairie, Grand Isle County
Frank Jones, Lamoille County
Edson E. Gifford, Orange County
Clyde S. Vance, Orleans County
Charles L. Winslow, Rutland County
Emile Bordeaux, Washington County
Myron W. Allen, Windham County
Lloyd Jewett, Windsor County

Others contributing to the discussion included:

Extension Service representative
Soil Conservation Service representative
Federal and State Forest Service representatives
Farmers Home Administration representative

Note: This report is based on the conference committee recommendations and includes the changes as adopted by the general conference.

Vermont State Office

PMA STATE CONFERENCE
Burlington, Vermont
May 28-29, 1953

Report of Conference Committee on Public Relations

Hugh E. Evans, Chairman, opened the meeting by stressing the importance and needs of a good Public Relations Program. He reviewed the Public Relations Program as set up in January by the State PMA Committee for the State, and also what had been accomplished in carrying out the recommendations adopted by the 1952 State PMA Conference. He then turned the meeting over to Glen Button, Vice Chairman, to lead the discussion on what the group recommends for a Public Relations Program. The group made the following recommendations for the conference as a whole.

News Releases

It was recommended that news releases be continued on the present basis. It was further recommended that there be closer cooperation at the county level with the county agent in scheduling news releases.

Radio

It was recommended that the use of the radio be continued on the present basis at the State level and that counties continue their efforts to get programs over local stations.

Special Feature Stories

It was recommended that the State Office continue to supply stories to the largely circulated newspapers, magazines and company periodical publications.

Publications

It was recommended that the County Practice Handbook be continued on a printed basis and sponsored by local advertising. The group felt that community committeemen should take an active part in securing the advertising.

Meetings With Organizations

It was recommended that county committees continue to work with other organizations and that the community committeemen take the responsibility of letting local organizations know of PMA personnel available to speak at their meetings.

County News Letters

It was recommended that county news letters be sent out as often as newsworthy stories presented themselves, but especially at the beginning of a new program year. It was further recommended that this letter be sent to the entire mailing list rather than to community committeemen only.

Conservation Information for Clergy

It was recommended that the Clergy be continued on the county mailing list. It was further recommended that Clergymen be invited to attend county committee meetings, tours and farmer-businessman dinners.

Conservation Bulletins for Schools

It was recommended that the State Office continue to cooperate with the State Department of Education in preparing conservation material for school curricula and that greater emphasis be placed on cooperation with schools at the county level.

County ACP Tours

It was recommended that county ACP tours be continued, the final decision resting with the county committee.

Farmer-Businessman Dinners

During the discussion on this topic the members from Franklin, Washington and Windsor Counties reported successful dinners held this past spring with good attendance, and they agreed that the time and effort were well spent. The group recommended that counties continue to consider the holding of Farmer-Businessman get-togethers. Eight counties indicated their desire to promote the holding of such gatherings.

Visual Aids

The continued use of slides at State and county levels was recommended.

Study Groups

It was recommended that at least one meeting a year be held with neighborhood study groups for the purpose of discussing agricultural conservation.

Mr. Don Elberson appeared before the committee and explained the organization of the Vermont Council of World Affairs. After much discussion the group agreed that the objectives and services of the Council as carried out in Vermont should be recognized.

Reference Cards

Considerable discussion was brought out in regard to the value of reference cards bearing statistics and facts relating to PMA programs, budget figures, subsidies, etc. The group agreed that these were valuable, that they should be made available to county offices, and that distribution to community committeemen be left up to the county committee.

ACP Barn Cards

The group recommended that these be made available to counties, if possible.

Members of Committee:

Edgar W. Smith	Addison
John Lourie	Bennington
Donald Larocque	Caledonia
Ray W. Collins	Chittenden
Fritz Farmer	Essex
Marshall Dunham	Franklin
Alan K. Kinney (Not present)	Grand Isle
Arthur W. Stancliff	Lamoille
Glen A. Button	Orange
Robert P. Kilborn	Orleans
Roy Burroughs	Rutland
D. Drew Bisbee	Washington
Claude E. Bensenhaver	Windham
Ruel Abbott	Windsor

Visitors:

Stanley Judd	Commissioner of Agriculture
Don Elberson	Council on World Affairs
Ralph McWilliams	Franklin County Agent

Hugh E. Evans

Hugh E. Evans, Chairman
Glen A. Button, Vice Chairman
C. B. Doane, Secretary

Note: This report is based on the conference committee recommendations and includes the changes as adopted by the general conference.

Vermont State Office

PMA STATE CONFERENCE
Burlington, Vermont
May 28 and 29, 1953

Report of the Administrative Problems Committee

The committee wishes to make the following recommendations for the consideration of the conference as a whole in regard to the administration of the PMA programs at the county level:

Secretary's Regulations

The committee reviewed the Secretary's Regulations and agreed that they would be acceptable for use in their counties. The county committee will decide on policy and county office managers will carry them out as outlined in the regulations.

Elections

The committee favored holding community meetings as individual communities or two or more communities together where it seemed advantageous. The majority voted against elections by mail because in most cases tie votes required re-balloting.

They stressed the importance of election meetings being well organized, well announced, and recommended that community committeemen contact farmers by telephone or personal call the day of the meeting in order to get a large attendance. A well-prepared program would include: a. A good speaker; b. Starting the meeting on time and not having it too lengthy; c. Light refreshments; and d. Inviting the county agent to as many meetings as possible.

It was also recommended that where possible election meetings be held prior to training schools so that an explanation of the program could be given before the program started.

County Committee Supervision

The committee unanimously agreed that office personnel should keep entries on Forms ACP-203 up to date and according to instructions. They also agreed that community committeemen needed closer supervision to be sure that they were filling in all information required by instructions on sign-up and report of performance forms. The committee felt that consignees needed frequent supervision in order that their work would be accurately carried out.

Policy - County Office Managers' Salaries

The committee recommended that salary increases for county office managers should be based on: a. Quality of work and b. Length of service. Volume of work at the office and background should be given equal consideration.

County Committee Meetings

In a discussion of county committee meetings it was found that 6 counties are now holding regular meetings on a fixed day each month. The remaining counties do not have a fixed day for their meetings. All counties recommended that an agenda should be carefully prepared in advance of the meeting and copies sent to the county committee, county agent, and fieldman.

Minutes of county committee meetings were discussed and the importance of accurate and detailed minutes being prepared was stressed. The matter of inviting community committeemen to attend county committee meetings was left optional with each county.

County Training Schools

The committee recommended that training schools be confined to one day and that preliminary meetings of the county committee and county office managers be held to review forms and instructions prior to the training schools. The committee also felt that wherever farm plans had been developed for the farm full use should be made of these in determining the practices to be used under the ACP.

Enrolling Farmers in the Program

This committee believes that farm to farm contacts should be used to enroll farmers in the program.

County Practice Handbook

A discussion on the most effective use of county handbooks revealed that a large majority of the group favored the plan of having committeemen give the county handbook to the farmer at the time of the farm visit and discuss the handbook with him.

It was also recommended that copies of the practice handbook be made available to Farm Study Clubs and businessmen as soon as these handbooks are ready for distribution.

The matter of having a copy of the sign-up form in the handbook was left optional with county committees.

Notification to Farmers

The present procedure of getting out notices and letters of approval to farmers was discussed and the committee recommended that this procedure should be simplified if possible to eliminate confusion on the part of the farmers. The time of sending notices of approval out should be as soon as possible after approval has been granted by the county committee.

Reports of Performance

The present deadline of January 15 for filing reports of performance was accepted as entirely satisfactory.

Sales Slips

PMA letter 859 concerning sales slips was discussed and the committee recommended that county office managers who have not yet notified farmers and dealers of the requirements on sales slips should do so without delay. They also agreed that sales slips turned in by farmers should be more carefully scrutinized.

Prior Approval Work

In order to have prior approval work that is done by the Soil Conservation Service completed at an earlier date, the committee recommended that SCS secure sufficient help to do this work promptly. In the majority of the counties the Forest Service had completed their work reasonably early.

Purchase Order

The matter of using Purchase Orders for permanent type practices was discussed and the committee recommended that such orders be made available for this type of practice.

Members of the Committee:

Committeemen	County
Wayne Fuller	Addison
E. W. Mattison	Bennington
Norman Lowe	Caledonia
*Raymond Rowley	Chittenden
C. E. Wright	Essex
Stuart A. Newton	Franklin
George A. Caswell	Grand Isle
Howard Kittell	Lamoille
F. Milo Leighton	Orange
*Asa R. Drown	Orleans
James E. Brayton	Rutland
W. J. Bisson	Washington
Charles B. Holton	Windham
Max Rogers	Windsor

Visitors

C. Ely Wickham	Area Director (NE), PMA
Don Davis	Fieldman, New Hampshire
Harold Tompson	Chairman, Mass. State PMA Com.
James W. Williams	State Committeeman
John DeVito	Bennington County Office Manager
Mildred Murphy	Caledonia County Office Manager
Arlene Routhier	Orleans County Office Manager

*Not present

Edward K. Wright

Edward K. Wright, Chairman
Wayne Fuller, Vice Chairman
E. N. Blondin, Secretary

Note: This report is based on the conference committee recommendations and includes the changes as adopted by the general conference.

OTHER CONFERENCE HIGHLIGHTS

Blondin Honored

At the conference banquet Edward N. Blondin was honored with the presentation of a 20-year service certificate and pin. Mr. Macauley, Chairman of the State Committee, in making the presentation commended Mr. Blondin for his long and faithful service to Vermont Agriculture. He pointed out that "Ted" had become a familiar figure in Vermont agricultural circles and had really made contributions to the conservation effort in the State.

Mr. Blondin started work with Agriculture as Rutland County Agricultural Agent. He came to the AAA in 1936 as the first fieldman for that organization. He has served in this capacity ever since.

County Office Managers Meet at State Office

The county office managers met at the State Office on the afternoon of May 28. This was a general session at which time each county office manager had an opportunity to talk with State Office personnel regarding problems in connection with the ordering of supplies, applications for payment, conservation materials, audits and county accounts and budgets.

Area Director Present

C. Ely Wickham, Area Director for PMA (NE), attended all sessions of the conference and contributed his ideas throughout the meeting. At the close of the two-day meeting Mr. Wickham urged the group to continue the work which they had started, keep their spirits up and to do everything they could do as committeemen to make a better Agriculture.

Tom Blow's Services Recognized

Since this was the first State PMA Conference in many years which Tom Blow had not attended, either as a county agent or as PMA Administrative Officer, the group wanted to recognize his services. At their general session on the second day the full group passed the following resolution:

> "Resolved that this group go on record as recognizing the great contribution that Tom Blow has made to Vermont Agriculture, especially to agricultural conservation. This contribution has been made both as a county agent and as Administrative Officer for PMA."

The group unanimously adopted this resolution.

Dick Mercure and His Accordian

Twelve year old Dick Mercure entertained the group at the conference banquet by rendering several selections on his accordian and was very well received. He has appeared before various groups around the State and made several auditions in Burlington.